Radical Abolitionist.

"PROCLAIM LIBERTY THROUGHOUT *ALL* THE LAND, UNTO *ALL* THE INHABITANTS THEREOF."—LEV. XXV. 10.

VOLUME II.] NEW YORK, MAY, 1857. [NUMBER 10.

The Radical Abolitionist.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor,

Is Published Monthly,

AT 48 BEEKMAN STREET, NEW YORK.

BY THE AMERICAN ABOLITION SOCIETY.

Terms.

PER ANNUM, OR FOR TWELVE NUMBERS.

SINGLE COPIES	$0.50
FIVE COPIES directed to one person	2.00
EIGHT COPIES, do. do.	3.00
FOURTEEN COPIES, do. do.	5.00
THIRTY COPIES, do. do.	10.00

Payments in advance.

OBJECTIONS AGAINST RADICAL ABOLITIONISTS AND THEIR MEASURES.

REVIEW OF THE OBERLIN EVANGELIST.

(*Continued.*)

There remains one more link in the chain of the Evangelist's argument against a national abolition of slavery.

DANGERS OF CIVIL WAR.

"Emancipation in the States, by act of Congress, would probably lead to civil war."

Why does not the Evangelist anticipate 'civil war' from the suppression of the rum traffic,—the administration of civil and criminal law, generally—and especially from the 'Republican' attempt to 'effect' emancipation in Kansas (by 'a foreign power'?) without waiting, as Senator Douglas would advise them, to have it take place 'quietly, with good feeling on the part of the' Border Ruffians? If the Democratic doctrines of 'State sovereignty,' 'State Rights,' 'Squatter sovereignty,' 'anti-consolidation' and anti-'centralization,' are so 'pre-eminently' excellent and sacred in the fifteen slave States, why not accept them as equally conservative of the public tranquillity in Kansas? What exclusive claim to the National protection have the slaves and the free State men in Kansas, that may not as rightfully be claimed by the slaves and the free State men men of Alabama, North Carolina, and Virginia, in which Free State *white* men find no protection? The enforcement of liquor prohibition has cost a speck of civil war in Portland. The vindication of freedom in Kansas has cost more than a speck of civil war in that Territory, and threatens still more. The attempted election of Fremont, was at the hazard of a threatened insurrectionary invasion and conquest of the seat of Government, and the seizure of the National Treasury, National buildings, Navy Yard, and National archives, involving of course a general civil war. It is generally believed, among 'Republican' politicians who were conversant with the state of feeling among Southern Democrats in Washington City, that something of the kind would have been attempted in case of the election of Col. Fremont. And it is a part of our National history, that Ex-President Fillmore, then a rival both of Fremont and Buchanan, not only expressed his anticipation of such a struggle, but openly justified it, on the part of the slaveholders, and yet received Northern votes! Why did not 'the Republican party' stand aloof from the polls at the Presidential Election? And why, (instead of voting with them) did not our good brother of the Evangelist advise them to refrain from exercising the elective franchise, in that direction, until the object they had in view could 'take place quietly—with good feeling on the part of' Messrs. Douglas, Atchinson, Stringfellow, Shannon, Pierce, Butler, Keitt, Toombs, Brooks, and the slaveholders of South Carolina and Georgia?

If civil war may be hazarded on the comparatively narrow issue of 'freedom in Kansas,' and with only the limited local support of that issue, why might it not as well be hazarded, against the *same* opposition, but with the accession of Southern aid, on the broader issue of freedom in the whole nation, including Kansas, of course?

OF WAR, AGAINST AN ABOLITION ACT.

'Would probably lead to civil war?' Let us see. The Census of 1850 gives us returns of 347,525 slaveholders, by counting part of them twice, and including women and children. By a liberal estimate, we may suppose it possible that 100,000 of these are adult males, capable of bearing arms, and willing to do so, against National Abolition. These are scattered all over the slave States, in the midst of non-slaveholders and slaves—six millions of the former, and three and an half or four millions of the latter. On *suspicion* of insurrectionary designs on the part of *ten* slaves in upper Tennessee, the entire body of slaveholders in fifteen States have recently been thrown into a state of alarm. And, more recently, a single female lecturer on physiology, disturbs the quiet of South Carolina. Suppose now, a national proclamation of liberty to all the slaves, should be sent forth, who of the 100,000 would there be to oppose it? From what city, from what county, from what State, could a draft of one man among ten of them, be spared to go into an insurrectionary army, against the National Government? Who, or how many of them could leave their own plantations and firesides? How many of them would be willing to go? From whence could they enlist recruits?*—From what Treasury would come the money to pay them? The utter helplessness of the slaveholders in such a case, is as evident as figures can make it. An insurrection of rum-sellers or of lottery-venders would be a thousand times more feasible. The victims of these would commonly be enlisted on their side. The very reverse would be the fact in respect to the victims of the slaveholders.

OF CIVIL WAR IN KANSAS.

It would be no wild estimate to say that the dangers of civil war from a National act of abolition, the Government (as the idea of such an act supposes) being on the side of abolition—could not half equal the dangers of civil war during the past year, arising from the effort to establish freedom in Kansas. In the latter case we have ventured to pit the friends of freedom in the free States against the Slave Power while it had the Federal Administration as completely at its beck as the slaves themselves, and while the slaves were in their wonted subjection, without any hopes or prospects of freedom. But in the case of a National proclamation of Abolition, we should only have to pit the friends of freedom at the North and at the South, the non slaveholding whites, free colored, and slaves, backed up by the National Government and its Treasury, against the 100,000 slaveholders! The contrast is almost inconceivable. How astonishing that after having braved the dangers of civil war during the past twelve months, familiar with the purchase of Sharpe's rifles, treading dubiously on the confines of revolutionary insurrection, and under the ban of proscription for treason—(some of them lying in the jails at Lecompton) the 'Republican' friends of 'free Kansas' should start back affrighted at the proposal of a peaceful abolition of slavery by the ballot-box, lest it should lead to civil war! It strikes us that 'anti-slavery' men who 'acted recently with the Republican party,' should not be forward to urge *such* an objection.

OF DANGERS OF A SERVILE WAR.

What!—A National Abolition of Slavery 'lead to civil war'! Pray tell us what else, beside a National Abolition of Slavery can *prevent* a civil war, that shall deluge the South with blood? What but the lingering hope of such abolition prevents the rising of the slaves? What else has prevented it for the last fifty years? Who does not know the forebodings of Jefferson on this subject? Who has not read his declaration—'I tremble for MY

* The Richmond Enquirer, soon after the recent panic, gave the following account of the military forces of Virginia:

"To be sure, the Governor's staff is large enough for the Generallissimo of an infinite army, but the entire military force of the State might be garrisoned in a country meeting house, or paraded on the playground of an old field school."

COUNTRY' (not the South merely) 'when I reflect that God is just, and that his justice cannot sleep forever.' 'The Almighty has no attribute that could take sides with us, in such a contest.'

WHAT IS DOING TO AVERT CIVIL WAR?

And what power had Free Soilism, with its 'No more Slave States'—or the 'Republican' party, with its 'freedom for Kansas,' to avert the catastrophe, or to grapple with it—against 'every attribute of the Almighty,' when the struggle shall come? Could any madness exceed that of those 'anti slavery men' who 'acted with the Republican party,' with the terrible hazards of such a contest impending over them, when they practically adopted the pledge of their Presidential Candidate, '*not* to interfere with slavery where it exists under the shield of State sovereignty'—well knowing, as they did, that, under such a President and on such a platform, a general rising of the slaves would precipitate the nation, including emphatically themselves, into just such a 'civil war'? And now they turn round—do they?—and raise the hue-and-cry of a 'civil war' against the only political party in the country that has ever lifted a finger to avert civil war, or done otherwise than to rivet the fetters that must eventually precipitate it.

Of Prospects of Peaceful Abolition in the States.

If it be said that abolition by the States would equally avert the catastrophe, the question returns—What right has the nation to continue the tolerance—in other words, the protection of slavery, under the plea that it *might* be abolished by the States? What right has the Nation, any more than the States, to tolerate and thus protect it, for a single day? What prospect is there of its being abolished by the *States* while it is protected by the *Nation?*

Attempts to abolish slavery by State action, one State moving at a time, one State thwarting a neighboring State, as Missouri is thwarting Kansas, different parties opposing each other in the same State, and balanced and counterbalanced by intrusive invaders, pro and con, without any National interference or protection, would be a thousand times more liable to result in civil war, than a simultoneous National Abolition. Any one can see this, and can see that whereas a National Abolition might quietly settle the whole question in one short month, and with less violence than has already occurred in Kansas, a series of struggles, conquests and counter-conquests, in fifteen different States, might embroil the slave region for a quarter of a century, and render dubious the final result, after all. If there are any benefits to be derived from the extended nationalities of which the peoples who are included in them are so boastful and so tenacious, they may be comprised, mainly, in this—that petty jurisdictions do not embroil, distract, and thus brutalize and subjugate the peoples who sit under the broad national shadow. If 'the union of the States' be worth preserving, it must be for purposes like these. If a National Government be worth supporting, it is for such ends.

Of civil war against Slavery extension.

The quarrels between 'non-extensionists' and slavery-propagandists, already threaten to plunge the Northern and Southern States into civil war, unless slavery be abolished. When Northern men who oppose the extension of slavery into new *Territories*, are ready to pledge themselves to let slavery alone in the *States*, they forfeit the respect of slaveholders, and lose all hold upon their consciences. They get no credit for philanthropy, for enlightened patriotism, or for moral or religious principle. The slaveholders conclude, at once, that it is all a matter of self-interest with the Northerners, that they only wish to monopolize the new Territories to themselves, and drive the Southern people out of them. The tone of Republican speeches and Editorials, for the year past, has not done much to allay this suspicion. Their disclaimers of any design to disturb Southern slavery must be either believed or disbelieved. If believed, they are put down as coming from neither patriots, philanthropists, nor Christians. If disbelieved, they are put down as coming from hypocrites and deceivers. In either case, the controversy grows more and more bitter, and must continue to do so, unless the North submits, or unless slavery is abolished. We look in vain into the nature and the progress of the 'non-extension' controversy, as carried on for several years past, for the prospect of any other *terminus* than either Northern submission or civil war. The slaveholders, *remaining* slaveholders, *cannot* retreat, and will not. Remaining slaveholders (with their 'constitutional rights, as they call them, acknowledged) they *need* not. Northern submission or civil war, comes, of course. And it comes, under the disadvantage of *not* having been waged upon any issue that could enlist the consciences, the sympathies, or the interests of Southern men, black or white, in our favor. We have long known that some of the most prominent, experienced, and sagacious leaders of 'non-extension'—disclaiming abolition—expect this.—One of them said as much, in our hearing, nearly three years ago. 'There is no use,' said he, 'for Northern men to go to Congress, or into the new Territories, unless they go armed.' The result has justified the apprehension. And 'the end is not yet.'

Non-interference tends to civil war.

'Non-interference' with slavery, where it exists, *must* result in civil war, in some form, servile or sectional, or both, because slavery *must* come to an end. We never hear the exhortation to let slavery at the South, alone, without being reminded of an anecdote of the late Bishop Hedding. The Bishop was 'anti-slavery,' but no 'abolitionist.' He 'hated slavery as he hated hell,' but exhorted his Northern brethren to 'let it alone.' The question belonged to the South. He dreaded 'centralization,' and was a great stickler for 'State sovereignty.' Above all, he cherished the unity of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which would be shivered to atoms, if the question were not let alone. And the Bishop had dear Christian brethren at the South. 'But, Bishop,' said brother D———, who had long listened to this strain—'You say slavery is wrong, and must come to an end—pray tell us when, and how it is to be overthrown?'—'Why, I'll tell you,' responded Bishop Hedding.—'The slaves will bear it, as long as they can,—and when they can't bear it any longer, they will rise and cut their masters' throats, and get their liberty!' So much for the statesmanship and the brotherly love, of 'non interference' with 'the constitutional rights of the South.'

Disunion encourages civil war.

Look next at the Garrisonian remedy for slavery—a dissolution of the Union. Look over the speeches and proceedings of the late Disunion Convention at Worcester, Mass., particularly the eloquent speech of Wendell Phillips. It comes to the same point. The Union must be dissolved, in order that the slaves may have the better opportunity 'to attempt' cutting their masters' throats, and frightening them into measures of emancipation. 'Hands off!' said the orator—'and let the two races fight it out!'

We sum up the whole, then, by affirming that our proposed abolition of slavery by the Federal Government, instead of leading to civil war, *is the only thing that promises to prevent it*, —that it involves no more danger of civil war than does the suppression of lotteries and rum-selling, and the administration of civil law generally—that neither the Republicans, nor the friends of free Kansas, nor non-extensionists, nor Disunionists, have any measures to propose that do not threaten civil war, vastly more than, on any reasonable calculations, could be apprehended from a National Abolition of Slavery—that attempted abolition by the States would be more liable to incite civil war than a National Abolition—and that 'non-interference' ensures civil war, either by a rising of the slaves, or by a contest between the free and slave States, or by both combined.

So much for the objection that Radical Abolitionism tends to civil war.

Albany, April 13.

On Saturday night, at a meeting in the Assembly Chamber, Hon. Henry B. Stanton, Hon. Gerrit Smith, and Gen. James W. Nye addressed the members of the Legislature on the Dred Scott case. Each gentleman recommended a stronger and more positive enactment than that proposed by the Joint Committee on this subject. Gen. Nye was in favor of an act with two sections—Sec. 1st. Every man in the State of New York is free, and any man who shall attempt to prove the contrary shall be imprisoned in the Penitentiary for life. Sec. 2d. This act shall take effect immediately.

The meeting was large and enthusiastic, and from the demonstrations the people are far in in advance of their too timid representatives.—Let those who hope to be leaders not be found following behind. (Cor. Ev. Post.

JEFFERSON VS. TANEY.—Modern Democracy says colored men are not citizens of the United States. Yet Jefferson, when the British took two colored men from the Chesapeake, on the claim of being deserters, issued an indignant proclamation, in which the following passage occurs:

"This enormity was not only without provocation or justifiable cause, but was committed with the avowed purpose of taking by force from a ship of war of the United States a part of her crew—and that no circumstances might be wanting to mark its character, it had been previously ascertained that the seamen demanded were native citizens of the United States."—*Hartford Rel. Herald.*

Radical Abolitionist.

NEW YORK, MAY, 1857.

☞ Letters for the Editor of the Radical Abolitionist, or or the Treasurer of the American Abolition Society, should be addressed to Post office box No. 1212, No. 48 Beekman st. New York. We shall then get them without the delay and extra charge of two cents for delivery by the penny post.

☞ TAKE NOTICE, *that we do not make any charges for papers sent to those who have not ordered or subscribed for them.*

OUR MAY ANNIVERSARY.

☞ The Executive Committee of the AMERICAN ABOLITION SOCIETY have made arrangements to hold a public meeting on Anniversary week, in New York city, at the City Assembly Rooms, 448 Broadway, between Howard and Grand Streets, on Thursday, May 14th, commencing at 10 o'clock, A. M.

The speakers engaged are Pres. BERIAH GREEN, WM. GOODELL, FRED'K. DOUGLASS, and Rev. HENRY H. GARNETT; and others will take part in the exercises.

☞ Editors, please copy.

NATIONAL CONVENTION DEFERRED.

The suggestion of some Radical Abolitionists, that a National Convention should be held on the 10th, 11th, and 12th of June, 1857, at Rochester, N. Y., with a special view to a Presidential Nomination for 1860, *was conditioned*, as our readers know, upon receiving timely pledges from 500 persons, suitably apportioned in the different free States, *to attend.* It was known that there were diverse views, in our ranks, in respect to the utility of so early a movement of the kind. And it was a novel experiment to suspend the question of holding such a Convention, upon the *pledge* of a sufficient number to attend, at a particular time and place. But it was thought best to adopt that course. The required number of names was not received, and consequently *the Convention is deferred.* Should changed indications or circumstances require or warrant the measure, a Convention may be held in the Autumn. For the present, it is postponed. Friends will learn from this, that—as we forewarned them—mere expressions of a desire to have a Convention, and approvals of the measure, will not *make* nor *secure* a Convention. The few who have been in the habit of attending, on such occasions, and of *not meeting* those whom they reasonably expected to find there, ought not to be further subjected to the labor and expense, on uncertainties.

There is, in the mean time, no ground for discouragement or impatience, at the result of this experiment. There is no reason to think that a similar proposal, by so few members of either of the other parties, *at the present time*, would have succeeded better.

A number of considerations have operated to dissuade our friends from coming forward so early. Even the excitement arising from the Dred Scot decision has produced an effect, the opposite of what might, at first sight, have been supposed. So much spirit has been roused in the *Republican* ranks—so many brave utterances have been issued from the Republican presses—such near approximations have been made by their leading editors, to the views we have so long insisted upon, that many who had relinquished all hopes of such a phenomenon, have almost or quite concluded that the Republican party itself, or at least a large part of their prominent leaders, are about to become Radical Abolitionists, in good earnest, so that we may soon avail ourselves of their extended organization, and stepping into it, save the trouble of getting up one of our own. And it has been thought that no obstacle in the way of this, should be interposed by a hasty nomination of candidates. The old story over again. Some extracts from the Republican papers, in this number, will show on what grounds, such expectations have been cherished; and (if we find room for all we have selected) will show, likewise, that there are indications, already, that the symptoms of sudden progress are almost as suddenly disappearing. The old exhortation to 'Live and learn' may be in place, here. The difficulty with some generations is, that they don't live quite long enough to learn the things that belong to their country's peace, in due season.

We hope to reap some incidental benefits from this decision of the Convention question. One common objection to holding it, at the present time, has been, that the cost of holding it, would be better expended in scattering tracts, pamphlets, and papers, adapted to the crisis, broad-cast, over the country. To *this* class of our correspondents, whose names we have on our files, we now say—"Well, brethren—the vote is decided on your side. The decision is, that the costs of attending such a Convention—counting the time and the money—shall go into the Treasury of the American Abolition Society. Come, then, and 'shell out' promptly and cheerfully. 'Walk up to the Captain's office and settle.' Not a man of you, we are persuaded, will fail to do this. We shall find no name on our files whose owner resorted to such an excuse to save his X's and XX's.—And a good many of them are now, 'constructively' pledged to us.

And as to the very respectable and earnest number whose names have been sent in, as pledged to attend the Convention, if held, we know we need not remind *you* that the saving you will have made in not attending the Convention should be appropriated to the cause.—You need not wait till the 10th of June, when you expected to expend it. If you have it laid aside for that object, it will do just as well (and a little better) now. If not, promptly, the tenth of June. Don't forget the day.

And this is a good place for saying that our Executive Committee have under consideration the project of starting a *Weekly Paper*, in connection with an enlargement of our monthly. *Nothing is wanting but the money.* What say you? Don't be bashful. We will attend to you, even if you *should* 'all speak at once.'

MR. GARRISON, in the Liberator of April 10, objects to a National Abolition of Slavery, that 'its enforcement would assuredly lead to a bloody resistance on the part of the South.'—The Liberator's objection is the same as that of the Oberlin Evangelist, to which we have inserted a full answer in this number. One fact is sufficient. The whole military force of Virginia, says one of its leading editors, could be accommodated in a country meeting-house.

But, how is this? Mr. Garrison is horrified at the prospect of bloody resistance to a National Abolition of Slavery. But at the Worcester Convention he could hear Wendell Phillips advocate disunion by saying—'Hands off! Let the two races fight it out!' And he could publish that speech in his Liberator, if we mistake not, without rebuke. Now it deserves inquiry whether a National Act of Abolition would be likely to produce as much bloodshed, as Wendell Phillips' process of abolition by disunion? Would Governor Wise, for example, be as likely to attempt a forcible resistance against the slaves and the Federal Government, combined, as against the slaves alone? And if resistance were attempted, in which case would the contest prove the bloodiest—and the most destructive to the colored people? Let common sense answer.

REPUBLICANISM OF WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

The National Era, Feb. 19, contains a speech of Wm. H. Seward at Oswego, N. Y., Nov. 3, 1856, just before the late election. The speech occupies upwards of four columns, and is chiefly an appeal to the prejudices of the 'whites' against the 'blacks,' whom the Democratic policy would throw into the new territories.—Throughout the speech we have the continual recurrence of the phrases, 'negro savages from the coast of Africa'—'forced barbarian black labor to be imported from Africa'—the 'African black slave trade'—'African slave labor'—'black African slave labor'—'black imported African slave labor,' &c. &c. These are contrasted with 'free white European labor'—'free white labor'—'free white labor'—'free white labor'—'free white industry'—'free white labor'—'*imported* white labor'—'free white native and foreign labor'—'naturalized and native free white labor,' &c. &c. The former (the *black*) is deprecated—the latter (*white*) is advocated. Not a hint in favor of 'free *black* labor' is anywhere to be found, nor any implication that the labor of 'blacks' can be anything but 'slave labor.' 'Freedom' is always 'white' freedom, and slavery is 'black' slavery. And finally, the position of the Republican party, as the successor of the old Republican party, is thus stated by Mr. Seward.

"1st. The political equality of all white men within the jurisdiction of the United States, whether native-born or English, Scotch, Irish, German, Hungarian Swedish, Norwegian, Italian, or French; and whether Presbyterian, or Episcopalian, or Unitarian, or Trinitarian, or Protestant, or Roman Catholic, in their religious faith. This was the great element of the strength of the ancient or early Republican party.

2d. The exclusion of black imported African slave labor as far as is constitutionally practicable, and the substitution in its place, by constitutional means, of free native and immigrant white labor, with institutions of Government based upon it. This last was really the one single element of strength which pervaded all the parties which that early Republican party was ever called to encounter." *

* We understand Mr. Seward to say that both the original parties, the Federalist and the Republican, were "pervaded" with this "element"!

The Republican party, then, is founded on distinctions of *color*—the first example of a party that has openly avowed it, in the country.—Mr. Seward, when a *Whig*, would have repudiated it. We are disappointed in Mr. Seward. We had thought him to be making progress towards Radical Abolitionism. Bennett's N. Y. Herald had stigmatized 'Seward Republicans' as 'nigger-worshippers.' The charge may be withdrawn. 'Political equality of all *white* men,' forsooth! In what part of our Constitution, Articles of Confederation, or Declaration of Independence, is any such idea to be found?

The above was written before the decision of Judge Taney in the Dred Scots case, founded on the assumption that the negro has 'no rights which the white man is bound to respect.' Can such a decision be wondered at, after such a prominent 'Republican' as Wm. H. Seward had uttered such sentiments, and after they had been circulated, as orthodox, in the National Era?

Rev. S. J. May on Disunion.—At the Garrisonian Anti-Slavery Convention at Rochester, as reported in Frederick Douglass' Paper of February 13, Rev. Samuel J. May spoke as follows.

"Mr. May was not prepared to go with Mr. Garrison for an immediate dissolution of the Union, not because he had any great reverence for it, but because he thought that Slavery could be abolished more summarily under the Constitution, susceptible as it is of an Anti-slavery construction, than by attempting to bring the People up to the dissolution standard. He was not at all certain that the dissolution of the Union would be at the end of Slavery."

REPUBLICANISM AND KANSAS.

The New York Courier and Enquirer, a Republican paper, treating of Kansas affairs, (April 16) has the following:

"But the law thus submitting to the people of Kansas the adoption of their Constitution and determining their future character, must expressly provide, that every inhabitant of *Kansas* on the day of the passing of such a Law, shall have a right to vote upon the adoption or rejection of their Constitution, regardless of all Territorial legislation upon the qualifications of voters.

"If under such a submission of the questions to the people of Kansas, they shall elect to make Kansas a Slave State, the Republican party will not object. We recognise the right of every State to adopt such local institutions as they please; and if the people of the State of *Kansas* desire Slavery we shall not oppose their wishes. How Mr. Walker and the Executive intends to act upon this question, we do not pretend to *know*, but we believe that the course here indicated will be pursued, and thus all difficulties in regard to *Kansas* becoming a Free State will be obviated. Now that the spoils have been measureably distributed, we shall probably perceive signs of the actual intentions of the Government in relation to the great national question which are pressing upon it."

Is this the Republican doctrine? We trust the *Tribune* would not say so. But it must be confessed that the 'Pittsburg and Philadelphia platforms' did not distinctly pledge the party to 'object' to the admission of new slave States. The proposal to do this, was made at Pittsburg, but was overruled. Nevertheless, the party went, strong for 'free Kansas.' Kansas seemed to be the pet—the exception. But pets cannot always remain pets.

Methodists Moving.—The New York (East) M. E. Conference, at their annual session at Brooklyn, recently, took action on the subject of slavery. The majority report of a Committee previously appointed, reported as follows:

"Resolved, That we regard slavery as a great moral and social evil, a violation of the rights of man, and opposed to the spirit and progress of the Christian religion.

Resolved, That we will use what influence we possess to prevent its extension into regions and communities in which it does not at present exist, and will use all means that may with propriety be used by Christian ministers to effect its extirpation from the world."

The following is the minority report, presented by Charles Grove.

"Resolved, That we regard slavery as a great evil, threatening the peace and prosperity of this Republic, the permanence of the Union, and the stability of the Government.

Resolved, That the M. E. Church has been from its commencement anti-slavery in spirit, both by precept and example.

Resolved, That the action had by the late General Conference of our Church on the question of slavery furnishes us with cause for gratitude and thanksgiving to God for favorable results to the Church, giving her peace and prosperity in all her labors.

Resolved, That while we are opposed to slavery, and have no sympathy with the institution, at the same time we are equally opposed to the radical measures and reckless policy pursued by many of the professed friends of the slave for his emancipation, and that we have no sympathy whatever with their revolutionary movements.

Resolved, That as ministers of the gospel we will do what we can, not inconsistent with our calling, for the extirpation of the great evil of slavery; and that while we endeavor to 'break every yoke and let the oppressed go free,' we will pray for the master and slave, as well as for kings and all that are in authority, that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty."

The minority Report was advocated by Rev. Dr. Kennedy, in a corresponding speech. The *majority* Report was advocated by Rev. Messrs. Hatfield, Inskeep, and Woodruff, and almost unanimously adopted.

A day or two afterwards, the 'agitation' was re-opened by Rev. Dr. N. Bangs, and Rev. J. H. Perry, by offering the following—

"Whereas, The Conference has declared that slavery is a moral and social evil, and an impediment to the progress of the Gospel; and whereas we have resolved to do all we can, consistently with our character as ministers of Christ, to extirpate it from the world; therefore

Resolved, That a committee of five be appointed by the President of this Conference, three of whom in the city of New York, and two in the city of Brooklyn, who shall meet at such time and place as they may appoint, between this and the next session of the Conference, whose duty it shall be to devise the best plan which in their judgment is practicable for the emancipation of the slaves of our country, said committee to report its doings at the next session of the Conference."

Dr. N. Bangs defended *himself* from the slander of being 'pro-slavery' or 'dough face.' Also he defended John Wesley from the 'slander' of his having said that 'slavery is the sum of all villainies.' 'Wesley never said any such thing, and he hoped John Wesley would not be slandered by putting words into his mouth that he never uttered.' Rev. Mr. Perry said 'the people had a right to determine whether they would have slavery or no.' 'New York had a perfect right to introduce slavery, if they saw fit.' 'The slaveholder committed no crime.' He deprecated 'the flippant arraignment of the Judges of the Supreme Court as men devoid of integrity and ignorant of the law, when their accusers had scarcely read the Constitution, and none of the decisions of the Supreme Court.'

An exciting debate was kept up till the recess, but not resumed in the afternoon—nor afterwards, so far as we can learn. We condense this from the New York Tribune of April 21 and 23. A Methodist friend tells us that the Bangs party, what few there were of them, were glad to drop it. Quite a change since June 1836, when the New York Annual Conference resolved, 'that we are decidedly of the opinion that none ought to be elected to the office of deacon or elder in our Church, unless he give a pledge to the Conference that he will refrain from agitating the Church with this subject,' &c.

THE BOTTOM LINE

Of 'non-extension,' in the form of 'Wilmot provisos,' 'No more slave States,' and 'free Kansas,' as set forth by Whigs, Free Soilers, Free Democrats and Republicans, on the policy of 'letting slavery alone in the States where it exists under the shield of State sovereignty,' is rapidly reaching its ultimatum. Not only has the Supreme Court put its veto upon it, and on logical grounds that must forever place the decision beyond the reach of those who concede the constitutional recognition of property in man: the advocates of 'non extension' and 'free Kansas' are finding it impossible to agree among themselves, upon any measures for the defence of 'free Kansas.' This is not strange. When men plume themselves upon becoming 'practical business men,' by ignoring or deriding the fixed moral laws by which God governs the world, and according to which he has declared, and sworn by himself, in his Holy Word, that he will govern it, what less is to be expected in their counsels than the confusion of Babel? A child can tell what is *right*. An archangel cannot tell what is *expedient*, or will 'effect the greatest amount of good' when the right is departed from. The National Era has stood, where the New York Tribune now seems to stand, at the head of the non-extension movement. How widely they differ, will be seen from what follows. The Tribune, in this instance, has evidently the advantage, because it insists upon the right. May it soon learn the advantage of insisting upon the right, for the States, as well as the Territories.

From the New York Tribune, April 27.

"The National Era is winning golden opinions and a liberal advertisement from the Buchanan journals, by urging the Free State men of Kansas to succumb to the Border Ruffian usurpation, and vote at the Constitutional Election ordered by the bogus Legislature. Its recent demonstration on that side is lauded by the Oswego Palladium as the 'conscientious advice of an honest, practical man.' The following passage from the Era, which purports to quote from and reply to some article found in our columns, is very generally and exultingly copied by the Administration organs:

"'The Free State men allow them to do as they please.' Ay, and when the work is done, we shall have an outcry against the frauds of

the census. But what good will it do *then?* Where will be the proof of fraud? If the 'Free-State men allow them to do as they please,' to enter or not enter their names, and to enter spurious Pro-Slavery voters, and give themselves 'no trouble' about it, they may thank themselves if their rights are trampled upon. We do think it is high time to give up this policy of political emasculation."

—The issue being thus made upon us, we are constrained to discuss *The Era's* position. We will ask its attention, then, to the following facts:

1. The course which it condemns was never urged upon the Free-State men of Kansas by THE TRIBUNE, nor, so far as we are aware, by any other Republican journal outside of their own limits. We expressly and steadily regarded and represented the question of voting or not voting at this Constitutional Election as one which the People of Kansas must decide for themselves, and with which outsiders should not meddle. Not till the Free-State party had held their State Convention, and unanimously resolved not to take part in this bogus Election, did we advocate that course. We followed their lead, and are still following it. All that is urged against intermeddlers and officious advisers hits elsewhere than here.

2. We ask *The Era* to point out *what it is* that the Free-State men of Kansas might do to promote their cause but are now neglecting. That paper talks of their "entering or not entering their names" on the bogus registry, as if they had some choice in the premises. Will it point us to that provision of the bogus Convention act which enables or allows a citizen of Kansas to "enter his name" on this registry, or have it entered? We know of none. The census-takers (all intensely Border Ruffians) are empowered to register voters, and the Probate Judges (also Pro-Slavery) may revise the lists; but the voters are no wise invited or authorized to do anything in the premises. The part assigned them is a purely passive one up to the day on which the census lists shall be posted.

The census was to have been completed last month, whereupon the act proceeds:

"Sec. 4. It shall be, and is hereby made the duty of each Probate Judge, upon such returns being made, *without delay*, to cause to be posted at three of the most public places in each election precinct in his county or election district, one copy of such list of qualified voters, to the end that every inhabitant may inspect the same and apply to said Probate Judge to correct any error he may find therein, in the manner hereinafter provided."

Our last letter from our correspondent in Lawrence is dated April 16, and up to that day *no list of voters had been posted anywhere in that* (Douglas) *or the adjoining County of Jackson.* Our correspondent is vigilantly watching for the appearance of these lists, but as yet has obtained no trace of them. From other parts of Kansas we have similar advices, and no tidings of a list of voters posted anywhere. Meantime, weeks are slipping by, and the Election coming on, without a chance being afforded to the Free-State men to do anything whatever. How is it, then, that the Free-State men of Kansas, and those in the older States who justify their course are assailed with such terms of reproach as we quote from *The Era?*

3. Advices from Kansas say that in Leavenworth, where the Free-State men have just polled over three hundred votes, under a charter which confines suffrage to residents of six months or over, there are but *eighty* names of Free-State men on the bogus registry list—that not half the Free-State citizens of Lawrence have been listed—that three thousand Missourians are listed as residents of Johnson County, where there are as yet not a hundred settlers, &c. We do not know that these statements are true—we *cannot* know it till the lists shall be published; but we have no doubt that the thing is all set—that a Pro Slavery majority will be borne on the registry, a Pro-Slavery Convention elected, and a Constitution framed accordingly. We see no way in which the Free-State men can escape being beaten by those who deal this game except by refusing to play.

4. In our view, any recognition of the bogus Territorial Legislature as a valid and authoritative body *is an admission that Slavery is* ALREADY *legally established in Kansas.* This is what we would avoid. It is far easier to *keep* Slavery out of a State than to *turn* it out. We solemnly and confidently deny that Slavery has any legal existence in Kansas. To recognize the Territorial Legislature in any way is to stultify ourselves and take the ground from under our feet. That ground gone, we do not know when or where we shall touch *terra firma* again. We choose to stand fast on the Free-State Constitution framed at Topeka, ratified by the People, sanctioned by the House of Representative, and this hour upheld and rejoiced in, by two-thirds of the settlers of Kansas. That Constitution excludes Slavery—the bogus laws authorize it. The irregularities attending its formation sprung directly from Border-Ruffian usurpations and outrages, and were by them rendered unavoidable. We stand here until we see other ground before us equally favorable to Freedom.

The N. Y. HERALD, in the midst of its bitter tirades against the abolitionists, its sneers at Seward and Greeley, as being 'nigger worshippers,' &c., comes out with a "Notice to the Political friends of Fremont," advising them 'to form, as soon as possible, standing Committees and Clubs in every town, precinct, city, or county of the United States,' preparatory to the campaign of 1860. Unless this is done, Bennett says, 'Fremont's supporters will be cheated by the corrupt politicians who are now seeking the control and management of the Republican masses.' 'Now is the time to begin the great movement for 1860 by forming honest centres of union and intelligence, against corruption, fraud, and *incipient revolution*'—that is, keep the Republican movement out of the hands of abolitionists and free-soilers! Having forestalled and controlled the Republican nomination in 1856, the Herald expects to repeat the operation for 1860. The Herald is out against State legislation liberating slaves brought in, temporarily, by their masters—hopes the negroes will not be admitted to equal suffrage in this State, and says 'We have no faith in the doctrine that all men are equal, because there is no truth in it.'—'We stand by the decision of the Supreme Court, as the interpretation of the Constitution, and as the doctrine of sound philosophy.'

Who goes in for the Herald's Fremont party? Has any one heard of any utterances of Col. Fremont on the Dred Scott decision?

Judge Taney declines furnishing the editors of the National Intelligencer a copy of his opinion in the Dred Scott case. No wonder he is ashamed of it. We doubt whether it will ever be published, *as he delivered it.* Already, the N. Y. Journal of Commerce is furnishing versions of it to suit its own purposes, and virtually denying that it contained the sentiment that the colored man "has no rights which the white man is bound to respect." As well might it be denied that he made any decision at all.—Like Lord Mansfield, he *may* live to *reverse* his pro-slavery decisions.

The late Election in Connecticut showed a serious falling off, from the Republican ranks since the Presidential Election, insomuch that they lost two out of their four Representatives in Congress. The N. Y. Evening Post accounts for this, by saying that the nominations were so made as to favor the late Whig members of the party at the expense of the ex-Democrats, whereat many were disgusted and would not vote. The fact may be as stated, but this was not the only nor the chief reason. The Dred Scott decision had knocked out the underpinning of the Republican platform, and nothing had been done to supply its place with something more durable. People of reflection will no longer vote on the mere issue of "non-extension" or of "freedom in Kansas," and the politicians will find themselves disappointed, if they expect it.

LIFE OF THOMAS MORRIS.—Of all the pioneers of the anti-slavery movement in the West, none held a nobler position than Thomas Morris. He was early in the field, when obloquy, reproach and loss of popular favor were his sure reward. But prompted by humanity and guided by principle, he never hesitated or faltered in his course. His personal influence was always in favor of liberty, and in his public acts he never forgot the slave. As a lawyer, a member of the Ohio Legislature, and of the United States Senate, he fearlessly, ably, and oft times nearly alone, defended and successfully urged his principles. As a popular lecturer, he also willingly served the cause, when to do so was to encounter slander and mobocratic violence. A most remarkable history for a politician who had been popular and successful for so many years. But with him Democracy was a principle to be embodied in individual and political action, not to shield the grossest enormities.—*A. S. Bugle.*

Thomas Morris was the Liberty party candidate for Vice President, in 1844, along with James G. Birney, for President. No language was too contemptuous, at that time, with the Garrisonian papers, in respect to the candidates of the Liberty party. We are glad that the time has come when one, at least, of their editors can afford to do justice to such men as Thomas Morris.

UTTERINGS OF THE PRESS.

We deem it important to put on record some of the utterings of the corps editorial, in respect to the Dred Scott decision. It is to be seen how many of them will act up, steadily, to their professions.

"This judgment annihilates all Compromises, and brings us face to face with the great issue in the right shape. Slavery implies slave laws—that is, laws sustaining and enforcing the claim of one man to own and sell another. In the absence of such laws, slavery cannot exist."—*N. Y. Trib., March 7.*

"If slavery cannot be limited, if its spread cannot be restrained, it must be expelled. The Court has declared that the Free States have no power under the Federal Constitution to limit or restrain it.—There is, then, no alternative looking to permanent relief and the re-establishment of the Government upon a harmonious basis, but expulsion. What, then, can be the effect of this atrocious judgment of the Court, coming as it does upon the heel of the long series of outrages and usurpations of the Slave Power, but the initiation of measures looking to this result, or to the others which, under another aim, will lead to the same end, that of breaking down slavery in the States?"—*J. S. P, in the N. Y. Tribune, March 10.*

"—An action proclaiming that in the view of the Constitution, slaves are property.* The inference is plain. If slaves are recognised as property by the Constitution, of course no local or State law can either prevent property being carried through an individual State or Territory, or forbid its being held as such wherever its owner may choose to hold it. This is all involved in the present decision; but let a single case draw from the Court an official judgment that slaves can be held and protected under National law, and we shall see men buying slaves for the New York market. There will be no legal power to prevent it. At this moment, indeed, any wealthy New York jobber connected with the Southern trade can put in his next orders: "Send me a negro cook, at the lowest market value! Buy me a waiter! Balance my account with two chambermaids and a truckman!" Excepting the interference of the Underground Railroad and the chance of loss, there will be nothing to stop this. But then these underhanded efforts for stealing property must, of course, be checked by our Police. Mr. Matsell will have no more right to allow gentlemen's servants to be spirited away by burglarious Abolitionists than gentlemen's spoons. They are property under even stronger pledges of security than mere lifeless chattels. The whole power of the State, the military, the Courts and Governor of the State of New York, will necessarily be sworn to protect each New York slave owner from the robbery or burglary of his negro. If they are not sufficient, why then the United States Army and Navy can be called on to guard that singular species of property which alone of all property, the Constitution of the United States has especially recognised. Slaves can be kept in Boston; Mr. Toombs can call the roll of his chattels on the slope of Bunker Hill; auctions of black men may be held in front of Fanueil Hall, and the slave ship, protected by the guns of United States frigates, may land its dusky cargo at Plymouth rock. . . We have been accustomed to regard slavery as a local matter, for which we were in no wise responsible. As we have been used to say, it belonged to the Southern States alone, and they must answer for it before the world. We can say this no more. Now, wherever the stars and stripes wave, they protect slavery and represent slavery."—*N. Y. Tribune, March* 12.

"In this method of constitutional interpretation we are inclined to suspect that our Taneys and our Catrons will find in Lysander Spooner and Gerrit Smith something more than their match; nor will this reckless upsetting on the part of the Court itself of every thing hitherto received as law as to the powers of Congress, fail to give those gentlemen an advantage which they will very well know how to improve."—*N. Y. Tribune, March* 13.

"We deem disunion most untimely, now that the highest tribunal—though extra-judicially, and without authority—pronounces slavery a National and not a sectional institution, making it a concern of the nominally Free equally with the Slave States. When this doctrine comes to be positively established, hereafter, it will be settled that slavery must pervade and control the *whole* Union, or be expelled from every part of it. We have not desired such an issue, but when that is made up and forced upon us by the Slave Power, we shall not shrink from it. Disunion involves the abandonment of our enslaved countrymen to perpetual bondage; we do not choose to desert them."—*N. Y. Tribune, March* 16.

"It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of this decision. It gives the sanction of constitutional law to the practical revolution which for some years past has been going on in the policy of the Government upon this subject, and engrafts upon the theory of the Republic the doctrines upon which Mr. Calhoun labored in vain, during the last years of his life, to rally even the people of the Southern States. But one more decision is needed to make slavery the actual law of the land, and render its prohibition in any of the States null and void; and this we shall probably have when the Lemmon case reaches the same tribunal which has just reversed the whole policy of the Government in regard to the Territories.

"No popular revolution will follow this decision, startling as it will be to the opinions and principles of three-fourths of the people of the United States. It will be accepted as the authoritative exposition of the Constitution, and regarded by all departments of the Government and by the people as the law of the land. No issue will probably ever be made upon it before the people, for the practical settlement of the question will anticipate any political result that might be reached. But it will profoundly affect the public mind in regard to the general question of slavery, and will change the issues which must inevitably come up sooner or later, in reference to it. That it will render them less absorbing in their nature, less disturbing in their progress, or more safe and peaceful in their results, no one who knows any thing of the temper of the American people, can for a moment believe.—*N. Y. Times, March* 7.

"This decision will lay the foundatian for a new party."—Ib. March 9.

"The decision is irreversible."—Ib. March 11.

(The New York Times, it will be seen from the above, has no fixed principle or determination about the matter. After a few days, the subject was almost dropped, in its columns.)

"The election of Mr. Buchanan as President in November was to put an end to the dispute, but since November the dispute has waxed warmer and warmer. It will never end till the cause of liberty has finally triumphed. Heap statute upon statute, follow up one act of Executive interference with another, add usurpation to usurpation, and judicial decision to judicial decision, the spirit against which they are levelled is indestructible. . . Hereafter, if this decision shall stand for law, slavery, instead of being what the people of the Southern States have hitherto called it, their peculiar institution, is a Federal institution, the common patrimony and shame of all the States, those which flaunt with the title of free, as well as those which accept the stigma of being the Land of Bondage. . . Are we to accept, without question, these new readings of the constitution, to sit down contentedly under this disgrace, to admit that the constitution was never before rightly understood, even by those who framed it, to consent that hereafter it shall be the slaveholders', instead of the freemen's constitution? Never, never! We hold that the provisions of the Constitution, so far as they regard slavery, are now just what they were when it was framed, and that no trick of interpretation can change them."—*N. Y. Evening Post, March* 9.

"In denying to colored men the claim to be citizens of the United States, Judge Taney imagines a state of public opinion throughout the civilized world, in regard to the African race at the time when our Constitution was adopted, which, in fact, had no existence. He imagines the black race to have been considered and treated by all civilized men of the white race as inferior beings, neither politically nor socially the equals of whites, and as having no rights which the whites were bound to respect. There is a great mistake here. . . But we deny that the origin of slavery is to be traced to the idea that the black man, on account of his race, was not, as a matter of strict justice, entitled to equal rights with the white. There is not a particle of proof to support this position. This prejudice of race has grown up gradually in our country, and is of late origin; it hardly existed seventy years ago, and does not even now exist to any extent in any other; it has grown out of the institution of slavery, and not the institution of slavery out of the prejudice. This prejudice is stronger now in our country than it ever was before; it has become greatly strengthened within our own remembrance."—Ib., March 10.

"When George III. was sovereign of the North American colonies, free negroes were just as much the subjects of his rule as free whites, and were entitled to all the privileges and immunities of a British subject. The first act of the colonists which certified to the world their determination to submit no longer to foreign domination, was the Declaration of Independence, which declared that all men 'are born free and equal.' We will thank Judge Taney, or any of his apologists, to name any act or law, convention or constitution of the federal government which divested free negroes of any of the rights which originally belonged to them as British subjects; we will thank them to produce any evidence that during the Revolutionary war and for thirty years afterwards, this right of citizenship was questioned by the federal government."—Ib. March 14.

The Evening Post of March 17, contained suggestions of a correspondent, concerning the importance and the best methods of securing the rights of colored citizens. But we regret to find in the Post of April 14, an editorial of a totally different character, commencing with—'Beware of false issues.' The editor fears that too much prominence will be given to the rights of the *colored* race, and too little to the rights of the white race. He says—

"Admitting, to the fullest extent, the duty we owe to protect and sustain all the rights of the feebler race among us, we cannot but regret the prominence which that question is acquiring, and the absorbing importance attached to it in our legislative and other political assemblies. In vindicating the wrongs of the black man, there is great danger that the Republicans may do what the abolitionists have always done—overlook the rights of the white man."

A most unjust and truthless aspersion.—When and how did abolitionists ever propose to sacrifice a single right of the white man?—What did they ever ask for the black man but that he should be protected in the same rights accorded to the white man? The Post proceeds—

"It is our duty to keep as much of our domain as we can, open for the free laborer, and prevent its being over-run by the negro, to the extermination or degradation of the white man. . . We hope the question will not be narrowed down to the less important question whether the negro ought to be a slave, or whether he can become a citizen. . . . Slavery in the United States, where alone it admits of remedial action, is beyond the reach of a national party."

"*Narrowed down!*" If the people allow the question to be 'narrowed down' by the New York Evening Post, their defeat by the slaveholders is as certain as any of the results of the physical and social laws by which God governs the world. Hatred of the negro will overturn the liberties of the white race in this country, if it is not speedily cured.

"So thoroughly is it understood that this decision is to be the basis of the anti-slavery movement and canvass for 1860, that we are informed that a number of parties imbued with anti-slavery sentiments, have already taken the initial steps for the formation of a plan of campaign for that year."—*N. Y. Herald*, March 9.

"The recent decisions of the Supreme Court upon the slavery question involve, among other things, a

* Did not Col. Fremont recognise slaves as *property*, under the Constitution, when he said he was "inflexible in the belief that slavery ought not to be interfered with, under the shield of State sovereignty"? If not *property*, the colored people are *citizens*, and entitled to Federal protection.

comprehensive reconstruction of our political parties and their platforms. Henceforth there must inevitably be a great Northern party, not upon Kansas or Cuba, nor any matter of Congressional legislation; not upon the ordinary issues of a change in the Executive administration, but upon the new and comprehensive issue of the changes of the Supreme Court Judges, necessary to reverse the majority of that ultimate tribunal from the side of Chief Justice Taney to the side of Justice McLean. . . To accomplish this revolution in the Supreme Court, the election of a President becomes an all-important issue henceforward, but still a secondary and subordinate issue, as embracing only the means for compassing the main question. In this view, it may be twenty years before the North will be able to secure a majority of the Supreme Court Judges; but in the interval, as every Presidential election may involve the appointment of a new Judge, every contest henceforward for the Presidency will turn upon that question, and as between the Northern anti-slavery and the Southern pro-slavery view of the subject. . . At present, the South is strongly fortified. It has the administration, both houses of Congress, and the Supreme Court as its constitutional defences. All the contested questions of Southern rights have been settled flatly and decisively for many years in favor of the South. But in the meantime, the agitation resulting from the Kansas Nebraska bill has resulted in the creation of a great Northern party. After the first shock, this party will most probably resume the field upon the broad issue of a gradual revolution in the Supreme Court; and upon this paramount issue we may prepare for a succession of sectional contests for ten, fifteen, or twenty years to come."—Ib. March 12.

"The decisions of the Supreme Court are the supreme law of the land."—Ib. March 16.

"No shaking of old ermines, nor fluttering of moth eaten silk gowns, nor invocation of the shades of Marshall, Jay, Ellsworth and Story; no extent of snivel and cant about the purity of the federal judiciary, and the obligation to put up with false law and falser equity, will avail at all to persuade the people of the free States that slavery has unrestricted rights in the public domain, and neither freedom nor Congress has any opposing rights therein—that people of African descent cannot be citizens of the United States, and that men and women can lawfully be held in slavery on free soil. No, the people will, from the very hour of this Dred decision, unintermittingly roll back this mixed conspiracy, till through a recovered and reorganised federal Judiciary, and a republicanised Executive, they can administer justice and good government to the whole nation."—*Albany Journal.*

"There is no middle ground. The restriction of slavery is a vain appeal, for your Supreme Court has extended the curse of human bondage wherever the Constitution has power. If we acquiesce in it we are doomed, and the slave power not only takes all our territories, but invades the States themselves. We have no alternative but to fight the monster slavery itself as a national evil, or to surrender to it entirely. We, for ourselves, have determined not to surrender, but to make war upon the accursed institution, which, in seeking to enslave the black man, is only preparing fetters for ourselves and our children. Such we believe is the sentiment of a very large majority of the people of the North."

"The U. S. Supreme Court having decided that men, irrespective of color, are property under the Constitution; that no legislation of any State can operate to divest a man once made a slave, of his property character, his chattelhood, and restore him to his manhood and to liberty; and that, as property, they can be taken and held in any territory of the Union; and having, by this decision, nationalized slavery and made it the law of the land, so far as their action is concerned, and begun an exterminating warfare upon the personal liberties of the free, there is no alternative left those who are not willing themselves to be made slaves, but to wage exterminating war upon slavery. The Constitution either guarantees liberty to all, or it guarantees liberty to none. It is either a free or a slave Constitution. If it is a slave Constitution it must be destroyed, and a free Constitution be substituted in its place, or Liberty must perish. If it is a free Constitution, its provisions in favor of freedom and against slavery must be enforced or the liberties of the people will be overthrown."—*Wisconsin Free Democrat*, April 1.

"In one sense we welcome these decisions as educational processes, by which the nation will be brought upon the true ground. Slavery is teaching us, by making it a national institution, that the nation is responsible for its continuance. As a nation, we are sadly at fault in our education in this respect, and have been induced to believe, that by a process peculiar to this nation, we have placed ourselves in a position that we are under no obligation to answer, when the question 'Where is thy brother?' is raised. Slavery is teaching us the slave is held by us, and we shall not be slow to learn that if such is the fact, we may not only let go with impunity, but we are tyrants in the meanest sense if we continue to hold on. We venture there has been more eyes opened to the fact that Abolition is the duty of this Government, within the last three weeks, than the yeaa preceding. The slave power will be fortified against it to the extent of this decision, so much more than before, but at the same time we shall be moved to greater activity, will strike for a higher mark, and shall achieve a more brilliant victory.—*Fon du Lac Commonwealth*, March 25.

"If, upon a fair trial of the issue, it shall appear that there are people enough in the Northern States to unite with the South, to declare slavery a national institution to be upheld, strengthened and extended by the general government, we for one at least will not acquiesce, but will labor to separate the living body from the dead carcass, and save a fragment from the general wreck, around which the hopes of the lovers of humanity can still gather, and in the advancement of which their labors can still be directed.—*Kenosha Telegraph.*

"And this is in the sacred name of law! God of our fathers! Whither are we drifting? Three fourths of a century have barely passed since the nation sent up a jubilant shout over the solemn declaration that "*all* men are created equal!" Now the highest Judicial power in the same nation as solemnly asserts that three and a half millions of our people have "NO RIGHTS" whatever!"—*Lansing (Mich.,) Republican.*

"Believing it as we do Revolutionary, and seeing in it, sad as itself is, but the first installment of yet more sad inferences and consequences, that come at its back, we hold it the right of Christian men to say, early and distinctly, that it is not abiding law or the genuine Constitution. The parallel that the history of British liberty and puritan firmness furnishes, occurred at once to our minds."—*N. Y. Examiner.*

"Ours is a slaveholding Government; we are a slaveholding people. We have no longer a Republic; our former position at the head of the world is now vacant so far as this court has power to make it so. Do not tell us that the great majority are free, prosperous and happy. Their freedom is but nominal. The despotism may not directly touch you or me; we may be able to travel where we please, (if we are not known as anti-slavery) we may have a right to say what we please, (in our free States,) or to print what we please, (if we do not circulate it in the slave States,) but so long as freedom is made exceptional, so long as it is not the supreme law, and slavery the contradiction and exception, we are none of us free. America has not so many serfs as Russia, but she crushes them lower. Russia mitigates and extinguishes, America strengthens, nationalises, protects and extends bondage."

Hartford (Conn.,) Press.

"Whether, after all the recent aggressions of the slave power, and especially this last monstrous usurpation, there be enough liberty worth living for, in our mis-named Republic, the true yeomanry of the country, who love freedom and hate oppression, must decide for themselves. For ourselves, we think it looks infinitesimally small."—*Worcester [Ms.] Spy.*

"The decision of the Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case, a synopsis of which we publish to-day, leaves a clear course for the establishment of slavery as a national institution. We offer no comments on this extraordinary decision: Let every freeman read it; and then, in view of the past and present aggressions of the slave power, determine if he can, what the *end* is to be.

President Buchanan in his Inaugural, holds that at length we have *peace* on the slavery question. In the same hour, almost, this momentous decision goes forth to the country! Where is the Patrick Henry of to-day, who taking this last abject and lowest prostration of the National Judiciary at the feet of slavery as his text, can startle the conservatism of the times with a repetition of the old strain: "Gentlemen may cry peace! peace! but there is no peace! The *war* is already begun!" Now is the issue to be made up—slavery *everywhere* in this Nation, or slavery *nowhere* in all our borders.

Wautoma [Wis.,] Journal.

"This decision is contrary to reason and the bible. It sets both at defiance. It usurps the dominion of the Almighty; and fails to dethrone Him only because it lacks the power. A colored person is not a citizen! not a MAN! He who was made in the image of God, for whom Christ died, metamorphosed, and the eternal decree of Jehovah set aside, by a counter decree of the immaculate Supreme Court of the United States! The Creator of all things—the Arbiter of the Universe—Eternal Justice—compelled to bow before this human tribunal! Shocking blasphemy! Unparalleled madness! It escapes eternal vengeance only through the long suffering kindness of a merciful God.

The unwonted atrocity of this act will remain a stench in the nostrils of every lover of Human Freedom, until its blackened memory shall have sunk into utter oblivion. We defy the decision. We trample it under our feet. We urge every colored man to stand for his rights. We urge preparation for a coming contest. Events are hastening to a crisis.—This great question must be settled; we fear in blood. Party spirit, in its madness, has yielded to the insatiable and execrable demands of Slavery, until retreat is scarcely possible.

We look in vain for help from the church.—*As an organization*, its power for good has long been paralysed. But there are multitudes of good men in the Church and out of it—men who fear God and hate covetousness: to them, the black race, bond and free, in this their hour of trial, earnestly appeal. Nerved for the conflict let all *trust in God and keep their powder dry.—Portland (Me.,) Journal and Enquirer.*

ANOTHER POSER FOR CHIEF JUSTICE TANEY.—The presiding Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States rested his opinion that negroes were not citizens upon the allegation that they have never been recognised as such by the General Government, either before or since the adoption of the Federal Constitution. His attention is respectfully invited to the following extract from an act of Congress, passed in 1803, which received the approval of President Jefferson and both houses of Congress, and has been recognised as constitutional by all the courts of the country for more than fifty years. This clause, it will be perceived, specially recognises the existence of colored citizens of the United States:

"Art. 1569. No master of any vessel, or other person, shall import, or cause to be imported, any negro, mulatto, or other person of color, not a native, a citi-

zen, or registered seaman of the United States, or a seaman native of some country beyond the Cape of Good Hope, into any place of the United States, situated in any State which by law has prohibited, or shall prohibit, the importation of such negro, mulatto, or other person of color." (Act of Congress, 28th February, 1803. Sec. 1, T. F. Gordon's Digest Edition, 1837, p. 453.)

Can any more conclusive evidence be desired to prove that the General Government did recognise the citizenship of negroes, in certain cases, than this most solemn declaration of the Government itself? and if not, when and by what act were their rights divested?—*N. Y. Evening Post.*

The party in Missouri styled the emancipation party, makes no pretensions to abolitionism as a moral principle. It proposes to be the 'White Man's party.' It seeks to secure the rights of free labor by the expulsion of slave labor. For example, one of the calls to a political meeting of the party just before the election runs as follows—

"WORKING MEN'S DEMONSTRATION.

Free Labor to make Missouri the Empire State of the Union, and St. Louis the Empire City of the West!

Let the masses turn out and battle for their Cause!

White men for our city, and our city for white men!"—*A. S. Bugle.*

Our National Charters.—Our Society have in the hands of the printers, a pamphlet (or book) containing—(1.) The Federal Constitution of 1787—9—(2.) The Articles of Confederation of 1778—(3.) The Declaration of Independence, 1776—(4) The Articles of Association, 1774—with Notes on the whole, showing their bearing on Slavery, and the relative powers of the State and National Governments.—It is high time that these important National Documents, at full length, were in the hands of every citizen, with suitable comments. This we hope to furnish in this publication.

This work is now nearly ready. It will occupy 144 pages 18mo. We shall sell it at sixteen cents retail—twelve cents wholesale. Postage not yet ascertained, but probably about seven cents per copy.

There will be an Appendix, containing extracts from the early State Constitutions, the Revolutionary Fathers, &c.

An Act to secure Freedom to all persons within this State.

The People of the State of New York, represented in Senate and Assembly, do enact as follows:

Section 1. Neither descent, near or remote, from an African, whether such African is, or may have been a slave or not, nor color of skin, shall disqualify any person from becoming a citizen of this State, nor deprive such person of the rights and privileges of a citizen thereof.

Sec. 2. Every slave who shall come or be brought, or be in this State, with the consent of his or her master or mistress, or who shall come, or be brought, or be involuntarily in this State, shall be free.

Sec. 3. Every person who shall hold, or attempt to hold, in this State, in Slavery, or as a slave, any person mentioned as a slave in the second section of this act, or any free person of color, in any form, or under any pretence, or for any time, however short, shall be deemed guilty of felony, and on conviction thereof shall be confined in the State Prison at hard labor for a term not less than two nor more than ten years.

The above is the Act passed by our New York Legislature. It will be seen that it does not quite carry out the profession made in the title. Fugitives from slavery are not included—the very class that most needed to be provided for. It is encouraging, however, to know that the Legislature came very near passing a true 'Personal Liberty bill.' Mr. Wooster proposed the following substitute—

"Sec. 1. Every person who shall come, or be brought into or be in this State, shall be free.

Sec. 2. Every person who shall hold, or attempt to hold, in this State, any other person as a slave, in any form, or under any pretence, or for any time however short, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and on conviction thereof shall be confined in the State Prison, at hard labor, for a term of not less than two, nor more than ten years."

This was lost by a vote of 43 to 54, a difference of eleven—so that a change of six votes would have carried the bill, nullifying the Fugitive Slave Bill! The Speaker, Hon. D. C. Littlejohn, gave it not only his vote, but an able speech. The influence of Gerrit Smith, who was at Albany during the agitation of the question, and who made an able speech in the Capitol, one evening, must have been effective. He had previously published and circulated a Letter to Speaker Littlejohn, on the subject.

Disagreement among "Republicans."—The Fort Wayne (Ia.) Times, a Republican paper, is out against what he calls "Greelyism," as contained in an article in the New York Tribune, which it quotes as having said, that we, at the North, "have the same right to interfere with Slavery in the Slave States, as with gambling, licentiousness and other fashionable vices. We have a right to do all we can by persuasion," &c. To which the Times answers, "Let such fanatics as Greely say what they will, there is but one sentiment in the true Republican heart, and that is, to secure freedom to *the white man*, a freedom in the free Territories, and were the question settled, so far as the Territories are concerned, and Congressional power to prohibit slavery, the Republican party would not seek nor engage in any agitation of that question."—To this sentiment the Freeman's Journal, Marion, (Ia.) another Republican paper, demurs and defends "Greelyism."

A number of well-meaning, *anti-slavery-ish* editors are horrified at the decision of Judge Taney because it disturbs their traditional dream that "slavery is the creature of law!" It is to be hoped that they will open their eyes to the fact that "slavery is the creature of lawlessness."

MET ON THEIR OWN GROUND.

We will not endorse the sentiment that the Constitution originated from a compact of the States. But it is instructive to see how the pro-slavery admirers of that theory are, in one particular, silenced on their own ground, in the following:

From the Cincinnati Gazette.

The Court has decided that the Ordinance of 1787 is, under the Constitution, void. Now, that Ordinance was enacted by Congress under the old confederation of States. The Congress being the representatives of States, and not voting by numbers, but by Sates, the Ordinance was, in fact, a compact between the States. It had, therefore, all the authority of the Constitution. The Constitution was created by a compact among the States, and though it went further and instituted a Government, it had no *authority* except by that compact. We do not say, with Mr. Calhoun, that it was a *mere* compact. But, beyond all question, it had no authority beyond the compact. The Ordinance and the Constitution, therefore, were derived from the same parties and in the same way. Their source, therefore, was the same, and they are of equal force.

To this we have the highest negative authority in the Constitution itself. That instrument not only contains no repealing clause of any act before passed, but it confers *no power* on Congress, Courts, or executive, to disannul or repeal a single act of the Old Confederation. Can any one suppose that the convention intended to overturn the ordinances, treaties, and public acts under the Confederation, and yet provided no way by which it could be done? The Court, therefore, in repealing the Ordinance by a simple decision, usurped their authority. But they did more. They committed a great political blunder. This will appear from these facts:

1. The theory of the Constitution adopted in the South, and more particularly by Mr. Calhoun's school of politicians is, that the Constitution is a mere compact. Hence they get the idea of States Rights, of Nullification, of the equality of the States, which they rely upon as the best defence of slavery, and consequently the unconstitutionality of legislating by Congress over slavery in the States. This may not be the unanimous view of Southern statesmen, but it is the prevalent one. In one sense, as we have said, it is correct. The Constitution undoubtedly originated and proceeded from a compact of the States.

2. The Supreme Court, in deciding the Ordinance void, have decided a compact between the States void.

3. They having previously decided that a grant was a contract, they have now decided that a contract under a compact was void.

4. They have decided, therefore, that compacts and contracts are void when they come in contact with the rights of a master to his slave under State laws! This is really practical nullification. Slavery is created by local laws. The Court decides that these local laws must be upheld against a compact between the States.

5. The corollary and conclusion from this is, that if the Ordinance of 1787 be void, then all compacts on the subject of slavery are void! We say this is the inevitable conclusion, for there is neither lawyer nor man of common sense who will affirm that a compact is binding on one party and not on the other. If the compact of 1787 is void when it comes in contact with the State laws of Missouri, what compact is binding against the laws of Ohio creating freedom? The final result then is, that if the principles set up by the Court as now reported, are correct, then all the compacts about slavery are void. The Constitution has no higher source of authority than the Ordinance.

Pro-Slavery Compromises.—Letting slavery cut off one hand first, next the other—then one foot, next the other—then one arm, next the other—then one leg, then the other! Where is the blow to fall next? Upon the neck? or upon the body?

But don't stir! Don't get up another "agitation!" "Quietly" is the word"—"quietly." Don't be "excited." "Keep quiet!"

The National Anti Slavery Standard, of March 28th, speaking of Judge Taney's decision, exclaims:

"How it ignores all history! how it sets all law at defiance! how it outrages common sense," &c.

We congratulate The Standard on its "common sense" view of the matter. We hope it will study history, the law, and the Constitution, till it learns how to grapple with such creatures as Judge Taney. There is no middle ground between Taney and the "Radical Abolitionists."